THE CONTEXT OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION - INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE STUDY OF PEACE AND CONFLICT

Ricardo Real P. SOUSA

Abstract

This paper provides a brief review of almost one century of academic research within the discipline of International Relations with a focus on the thinking about Peace and Conflict and its links to approaches in Conflict Resolution. The framework of analysis is based on the definition of science, what is studied and how it is studied, which delimits the analysis into the four debates in IR: between 1919 and the 1940s, the idealist versus realist debate; in the 1950s and 1960s, the traditionalist versus behaviourist debate; in the 1970s and 1980s, the inter-paradigm debate, and, since the 1990s, the rationalist versus reflectivist debate. This paper identifies how the classical conception of security centred on the state, the military and external threats was broadened by different approaches to include other actors (individuals, groups, societies, civilizations), other sectors (economic, political, social, environmental) and internal threats.

In tandem, it maps the epistemological and sometimes ontological challenges to positivism and rationalism found in (Neo) Realism, (Neo) Liberalism and Marxism, by a set of post-positivist and reflective theories or approaches, such as the cases of Human Security, Feminism, Post-structuralism, Constructivism, Post-Colonialism, Critical Studies, and the Copenhagen School. The emergence and development of all these theories and approaches are historically contextualized alongside developments of Conflict Resolution approaches.

com o apoio

Sumário

Este artigo faz uma breve revisão de quase um século de pensamento académico em Relações Internacionais (RI) relativamente à Paz e Conflito e suas ligações às abordagens de Resolução de Conflitos. O quadro de análise é baseado na definição de ciência, o que se estuda e como se estuda, que delimita a análise pelos quatro debates em RI: desde 1919 até à década de 1940, o debate entre o idealismo e o realismo; na década de 1950 e 1960, o debate entre o tradicionalismo e o behaviorismo; na década de 1970 e 1980, o debate inter-paradigmático, e; desde a década de 1990, o debate entre racionalistas e reflexivistas. O artigo identifica como a concepção clássica de segurança focada no estado, no sector militar e nas ameaças externas é ampliado para incluir outros actores (indivíduos, grupos, sociedades, civilizações), outros sectores (económico, político, social, ambiental) e ameaças internas. Simultaneamente, identifica os desafios epistemológicos e por vezes ontológicos ao positivismo e racionalismo característico das teorias (Neo) Realistas, (Neo) Liberais e Marxistas, protagonizado por um conjunto de teorias ou abordagens pós-positivistas e reflexivas, como é o caso da Segurança Humana, do Feminismo, do Pós-estruturalismo, do Construtivismo, do Pós-colonialismo, dos Estudos Críticos ou da Escola de Copenhaga. O surgimento e desenvolvimento de todas estas teorias e abordagens é contextualizado historicamente juntamente com os desenvolvimentos ocorridos nas abordagens de Resolução de Conflitos.

Palavras-chave Relações Internacionais; Estudos da Paz e do Conflito; Resolução de Conflitos; Grandes Debates

WORKING PAPER

*CEsA neither confirms nor informs
any opinions expressed by the authors
in this document.*

CEsA is a research Centre that belongs to CSG/Research in Social Sciences and Management that is hosted by the Lisbon School of Economics and Management of the University of Lisbon an institution dedicated to teaching and research founded in 1911. In 2015, CSG was object of the international evaluation process of R&D units carried out by the Portuguese national funding agency for science, research and technology (FCT - Foundation for Science and Technology) having been ranked as "Excellent".

Founded in 1983, it is a private institution without lucrative purposes, whose research team is composed of ISEG faculty, full time research fellows and faculty from other higher education institutions. It is dedicated to the study of economic, social and cultural development in developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, although it places particular emphasis on the study of African Portuguese-speaking countries, China and Pacific Asia, as well as Brazil and other Mercosur countries. Additionally, CEsA also promotes research on any other theoretical or applied topic in development studies, including globalization and economic integration, in other regions generally or across several regions.

From a methodological point of view, CEsA has always sought to foster a multidisciplinary approach to the phenomenon of development, and a permanent interconnection between the theoretical and applied aspects of research. Besides, the centre pays particular attention to the organization and expansion of research supporting bibliographic resources, the acquisition of databases and publication exchange with other research centres.

AUTHOR

Ricardo Real P. SOUSA

Assistant Professor of International Relations at the Autonomous University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal. Email contact: ricardorps2000@yahoo.com

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This paper identifies the main thinking about issues of war and peace in the (Western) discipline of International Relations (IR). The objective is to contextualize the emergence and development of concepts and research programmes in Conflict Resolution (CR).

The establishment of the first chair in International Politics (also referred to IR) in 1919 had the objective of studying the causes of war and the conditions of peace. Since then, International Relations came to investigate several other issues, and International Security Studies (ISS) is the IR sub-field that deals exclusively with issues of war and peace. This sub-field developed after the Second World War to shift the focus of research from war and defence to security, enlarging the relevant social sciences for the study of the phenomenon. Its initial focus was on the use of force in international relations and from the late 1960s it has encompassed economics, environment and society issues alongside the traditional focus on politics and the military.

CR as a field of study started around the same time as ISS after the Second World War and is characterized by the study of conflict as a specific phenomenon. CR has a normative concern to transform a society in a state of war (violent conflict) into a state of negative peace (the absence of violent conflict) and transform a state of negative peace into a state of positive peace (the absence of violent conflict and existence of social injustice). Conflict analysis and problem solving aimed at the resolution of disputes target the transition from war to negative peace, while conflict transformation aims at the elimination of the deep causes of conflict and targets the transition to positive peace as well as the development of non-violent conflict prevention mechanisms.

This way, we can identify three levels of interconnected thinking about peace and conflict: the more general discussions in IR, the more focused research programmes on security in ISS and the research and practice of CR[1].

The delimitation of distinct periods of thinking is frequently associated with significant international relations events, but the use of this intuitive criterion comes at a cost to the coherence of the scientific content of the periods created.

The influence of politics on research agendas and vice versa is unquestionable. Broad associations can be made: between the inter-Great Wars period and the Liberal-Idealist approach; between the end of World War II and the affirmation of Realism; between the Vietnam War and critical thinking, and; between the post-Cold War period and multiple paradigms. Substantively, an association can be made between the Cold War and issues of nuclear power, deterrence theory and East-West divide, and between the post-cold war and Civil Wars, humanitarian interventions and, after the September 11 attacks, terrorism. But overall, academic programmes have a theoretical and empirical development independent of current affairs (Levy J. , 2007)

The Cold War had different phases that influenced differently the study of peace and conflict (in particular CR) and the polarity of the international system has several important ramifications (in particular in IR), but these do not encompass the full spectrum of research and do not clearly match substantive and epistemological developments. The "behaviouralist" revolution in the context of which significant ISS research programmes developed (for instance, Peace Research) is not directly associated with the end of the Second World War or with periods of the Cold War. Also, the growth of paradigms in the study of

---

[1] The paper focuses on the most illustrative thinking in its connections with foreign policy and practice and for this reason it is not an exhaustive presentation of the different approaches. For additional sources, see the references identified in table 2.

peace and conflict, normally associated with the post-Cold War period, builds on earlier work of the 1970s and 1980s. As illustrated by Levy (2007), bargaining models of war, rational choice theory or behavioural decision theory per se are not directly linked to events or policy agendas.

A better criterion for the delimitation of periods is the definition of science: science is defined by "what it studies" and "how it is studied"[2]. The use of this criterion is, nevertheless, not a straight forward procedure. Looking at "what is studied", research following a Realist focus on power or a Liberal focus on "common self-interest" can be found throughout the 20th century. Even the textbook distinction between an inter-war Liberal-Idealist period and a post-Second World War Realist period is deceptive, as work on both approaches occurred in either period and both approaches have their foundations on classical texts. The classical focus on the state and the military continues to this day and the broadening to other referent objects (groups or individuals) or sectors (economic, social or psychology) did not occur in a coordinated fashion in time nor was the exclusive initiative of specific approaches.

The epistemological criteria of "how it is studied" provide a clearer proposal for a temporal delimitation. The "behaviouralist" revolution or the reflectivist/post-positivist approaches did branch out the social sciences even if it is only possible to delineate a period in which these developments occurred and with no specific year or publication. Accordingly,

---

[2] The inspiration for this paper is found on the book by Buzan and Hansen (2009) on the evolution of International Security Studies (ISS). This chapter intends to provide a similar account in a much shorter space but with a different focus - contextualizing CR - something that Buzan and Hansen opted not to include in their book. Buzan and Hansen (2009) use a framework of analysis based on: great power politics, technology, events, academic debates, and institutionalization. The option to focus this paper on the definition of science provides a more detailed account of the academic debates' dimension. The contextualization of these debates within IR and ISS offers an account of the dimensions of great power politics, events and technology (mainly regarding nuclear power). The institutionalization aspect is not explored in this paper.

the four (great) debates in IR can inform the delimitation of our periods as they provide an insight both to the conceptualization and to how peace and conflict is studied[3].

Four periods are delimited by the four debates in IR: the Realist-Idealist great debate in the 1930s and the 1940s; the traditionalist versus behaviourist great debate in the 1950s and the 1960s; the inter-paradigm debate in the 1970s and the 1980s, and; the rationalist versus reflectivist great debate since the 1990s. These periods are contextualized in relevant historical events and linked to security concerns in IR, ISS and CR.

The first period is the one up to the 1940s, the decade when the Second World War ended, an event which can symbolize the emergence of Realism as the main IR thinking after the failure of Liberal-Idealism to prevent a world war. Research in this period is characterized by traditional approaches such as classical political philosophy. This period is symbolically delimited to start in 1919 with the establishment of the first chair in IR and the political affirmation of the Liberal-Idealist tradition which shaped political thinking during the inter-wars period, even if IR traditions are grounded in classical works that precede this date. The main systemic change that occurs in this period is the change from British to American leadership, with inter-state conflict being the main security concern.

The second period occurred in the 1950s and 1960s when the "behavioural" approach challenged the traditional research methods. The behavioural approach is influenced by developments in the natural sciences but the urge to make social sciences "scientific" cannot be dissociated from the need to get the "methods right" in order to

---

[3] Some limitations of this criterion include the fact that the debates do not reflect the totality of events in the world, involve mainly Anglo-Saxon scholars, the boundaries between groups are blurred, some important works do not fit into one debate and some scholars question the existence of these "great debates". Despite these limitations, this criterion is preferable to other criteria (for instance, historical events, patterns of conflict or systemic characteristics) and is able to account for the development of academic thinking interlinked with the international relations of the time.

understand and prevent the potential mutual destruction impending on humankind in the early days of the Cold War nuclear standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union. Even if in the aftermath of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis there was a reduction of tensions between the superpowers, throughout the Cold War years the main security concern was the risk of inter-state (nuclear) conflict. This was the period when ISS emerged, shifting the focus from war and defence to security and when negotiation gained relevance as a CR mechanism focused on the management of the Cold War tensions.

The third period took place in the 1970s and 1980s during the inter-paradigm debate. Following the conceptualization of paradigms by Thomas Kuhn (1962), IR scholars debated which the most valid classical theoretical approach was. Humankind learned to live with the Cold War threat and could now analyse comparatively the different proposals advanced by Realism, Liberalism and Marxism. Even if in this period there were also calls for a post-positivist epistemology, these would not be significantly reflected in the approaches until the late 1980s. In the 1980,s there were increased tensions between the super-powers that only diminished when Michael Gorbachev became president of the Soviet Union in 1985.

The fourth period started in the 1990s and is characterized by the broadening of academic approaches with the debates between rationalists and reflectivists and between the positivist and post-positivist approaches. This period started in tandem with the unfolding of the Soviet Union, the emergence of the United States as the sole super-power and an increased relevance of intra-state conflict and human security. The main rationalist and positivist approaches of Realism and Liberalism are challenged by new reflectivist and post-positivist approaches consubstantiated in constructivism, feminism, post-structuralism or in the Marxist inspired critical approaches. The 1990s were characterized by the United States of America reflecting on the role it should have in a new unipolar system. After an initial

consideration of assertive multilateralism, the 2001 September 11 attacks firmly determined that the "Global War on Terror" was to replace the Cold War as the overarching security concern. More recently, it is the emerging powers, in particular China, which has drawn much attention due to its potential impact on the systemic security structure.

Table 1: Great debates in International Relations and security concerns

20th and 21st centuries	1919 to 1940s	1950s	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990s	Since 2000
Great debates in IR	Realism versus Idealism (1930s and 1940s)	Traditionalism versus Behaviouralism		Inter-paradigm debate between Realism, Liberalism and Marxist		Rationalists versus reflectivists	
Main systemic security environment	From UK to US leadership	Cold War (USA versus Soviet Union)				USA unipolar world	
	Liberal-Idealism since WWI (1914-1918) up to WWII (1939-1945)	Nuclear deterrence up to 1962	Détente up to Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, 1962-1979		Increased tensions, 1979-1985 Easing of tensions, 1985 - 1991	Assertive US multilateralism, 1991-1994	After 2001 "Global War on Terror" Emerging powers (in particular China)
Main security concern	Inter-state conflict	Inter-state (nuclear) conflict				Inter-state and intra-state conflict and human security	

The paper follows the four periods of IR debates, presenting the context in which they occur and a characterization of ISS and CR thinking. The intention is not to establish

or claim causal links but, instead, to highlight the historical environment in which academic thinking and political developments occur. Even if research programmes have an independent development, they are not neutral to the urgency of the phenomenon of conflict and to the aspirations for peace (or stability) in the world, which, to a greater or lesser extent, are embedded in normative concerns over the management of the status quo or its emancipatory transformation.

1919s TO THE 1940s – REALISM VERSUS IDEALISM

IR has three classical theoretical approaches: Realism, Liberalism and Marxism. These approaches branched out during the 20th century and permeated much of the thinking of ISS and CR.

Realism is characterized by a pessimist perspective of human nature which is transposed to the state level on the assumption that states always seek their own self-interest. The primary interest of a state is survival and power is considered to be the prime mechanism through which statesmen can secure it. Due to the anarchical nature of state relations, where there is no authority above the state, there is always the possibility that conflicting states' interests will lead to war. In this environment, states are permanently in a security dilemma wherein if state A increases its military power for its own security, it triggers other states to do the same, and thus state A may end up more insecure than before increasing its military power (Herz, 1951). In Realism, the potential for conflict is always present, and the periods without open conflict or stable are delicate balances of power or hegemonic exercises of control which may require conflict as an ordering mechanism. Classical references in this

tradition include Thucydides (c.460-406BC), Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527), Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) or Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-78).

Liberalism is defined by an optimist view of human nature with a focus on the regulation of power through reason, law and institutions where common interests or shared values can mitigate the potential for conflict among states and people. It is not a rejection of anarchy but a proposal that the risk of conflict present in anarchy can be decreased by institutional agreements reflecting the common interest, something which is in a state's self-interest. Peace is achieved through higher economic interdependence, shared human rights values (for instance democracy) and collective security. Collective security is when a coalition of states determines that the security of one state is the concern and responsibility of all, and where states agree not to attack each other and defend any state from attacks by another state. In Liberalism, the requisites to avoid conflict are institutionalized cooperation, shared norms and economic interdependence. Classical references in this tradition are Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), Jeremy Bentham (1748-1747) or Adam Smith (1723-1790).

Marxism is mainly concerned with the unfavourable economic conditions of the subjugated classes and is optimistic regarding the potential for their emancipation. Although Marxist socioeconomic analysis was not developed to explain international politics, its principles were applied to explain the occurrence of conflict and economic inequality between states. Peace is achieved through the removal of the structural economic domination of one entity by another entity (these entities can be states, individuals or groups of individuals). Since such transformation of power relations is difficult to achieve peacefully, some perspectives consider that conflict may be a necessary means to achieve a more just

economic relationship. Classical references in this tradition are Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895).[4]

Although different in their proposals, these three theoretical approaches shared the 18th century's European Enlightenment principles of rationalism, secularism and belief in scientific thought and progress. The common denominators of these social sciences are their hope and "devir"[5]. With the scientific approaches claiming a neutral analysis and the normative approaches that assume explicitly the objective of "becoming", the focus of academic research is on the challenges or "maladies" of the world, to explain or understand them, for society or groups to better manage the status-quo or transform it.

The Realist approach of the balance of power between the great powers, known as the Concert of Europe, was the main security mechanism in place in the 100 years prior to the First World War initiated in 1914. The war had unprecedented destructive results, required the total mobilization of the societies involved and constituted the trauma that led to a new period of Liberal-Idealist thinking intended to develop a science of peace that could go beyond the moral response of pacifism. This is the context whereby IR was established as a distinct academic discipline.

The inter-wars period was characterized by the adoption of a Liberal approach mainly concerned with the avoidance of a great war. It explicitly rejected the Realist principles of the balance of power and secret diplomacy. The approach, later characterized as Liberal-Idealism, was state-centric, based on the principle of collective security, and relied on the

---

[4] Marxism-inspired approaches gained preeminence with the affirmation of the Soviet Union as a superpower and the initiation of the Cold War. Some of its constitutive events included the sometimes conflictive decolonization processes of the 1940s and 1960s, the Korean and Vietnam wars, the covert American operations in Latin America and the adoption of the development agenda within the UN system (Buzan & Hansen, 2009).

[5] Nothing in this world is constant except change and becoming.

establishment of institutions of permanent multilateral diplomacy and international law to secure peace among states. The most symbolic examples of this approach are the creation of the League of Nations in 1920 and the signing of the Kellogg-Briand Pact in 1928.

The League of Nations was one of the 14 points proposed in 1919 by American President Woodrow Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference following the end of the First World War in 1918. A series of constrains limited the potential of the League of Nations to fulfil the expectations laid upon it. The first was the American Senate's rejection in 1920 of American membership of the League of Nations. Despite its incapacity to prevent the Second World War, the League of Nations constituted a significant attempt to institutionalize mechanisms for peace, which would bear fruits with the establishment in 1945 of the United Nations (UN), embedded in a more "realistic idealism".

The Kellogg-Briand Pact signed in 1928 is a clear illustration of why the inter-war Liberal period would be labelled as Idealistic (or even utopian). In three short articles, the pact stipulates that the signatories reject war as a means of settling disputes between states. In article one, it states that "The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it, as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another." The second article states that "The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means".[6]

The Great Depression in the 1930s alongside the rise of fascism in Italy and Germany and the Second World War diluted the faith in the Liberal-Idealism aspiration for peace (Kriesberg L. , 1997). In particular, World War II "settled" the "first great debate" in IR

---

[6] The third article refers to matters of ratification of the pact.

between Liberal-Idealism and Realism in favour of the latter[7]. Statesmen and scholars could not be "naïve" to the point of considering that Liberal ideals could outweigh the hard material considerations of power.

Furthermore, the failure of treaties and pacts signed in the interwar period had implications for the way agreements would be downplayed during the Cold War and, when signed, circumscribed to issues of arms control. In particular, the failure of the agreements made by Nazi Germany (in 1938 with Britain and France and in 1939 with the Soviet Union) in preventing the Second World War gave the insight for decades to come that lasting peace could only be achieved by solid victory (Wallensteen, 2001)[8].

Another significant process in the early 20th century was the use of "Satyagraha" ("struggle for truth") by Mahatma Gandhi in South Africa and India as a nonviolent form of resistance for political transformation. This approach would inspire political thinking and processes in the 20th century, such as the nonviolent active resistance against South African apartheid by Nelson Mandela during the 1950s, the Civil Rights movement in the United States in the 1960s or John Burton's 1960s problem-solving method for conflict resolution (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2011).

The new discipline of IR emerged in the 20th century in academia to study an issue-area so far analysed through the lenses of international law, historical diplomacy, philosophy, and political science. IR was state-centric and focused essentially on issues of violent inter-state conflict, with Realist concerns on arms race and war outbreaks and frequencies, Liberal

---

[7] See Carr (1939) and Morgenthau (1948).

[8] In this period, the Soviet Union progressively abandoned an international proletariat solidarity approach to international politics, something which could today be called a transnational social movement for the emancipation of the working class. In 1934, the Soviet Union gained membership to the League of Nations, adopting a state-centric approach, even if of a different nature of the capitalist one (Cravinho, 2002).

aspirations of peace-making and cooperation and Marxist interest on political revolutions[9]. Overall, the academic focus was on war, and at most on how to avoid war (Gleditsch N. P., 2008).

The methodology used was mainly traditionalist: philosophical, historical, legalistic and sociological analysis, which formulated theories not necessarily testable, based mainly on qualitative data and case studies in a process guided mainly by the intuition and interpretation of the scholar. The institutionalization of the new discipline occurred mainly in the United States and Europe and is associated with the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Chair at Aberystwyth University in Wales in 1919. Generally, the study of IR up to the Second World War cannot be characterized as a discipline with its own academic institutions, dedicated researchers and academic journals. At this stage, IR was characterized by individualistic proposals of scholars aiming to establish a discipline (Rogers & Ramsbotham, 1999).

1950s AND 1960s – TRADITIONALISM VERSUS BEHAVIOURISM

The literature of the post-Second World War was distinctive in the way it opened the door to a broader conceptualization of conflict. Conflict was conceptualized as linked to security rather than exclusively linked to defence or war fighting[10]. Even if only by the end of the Cold War was this broadening fully reflected in the literature, it opened the concept

---

[9] Other studies also focused on conflict through the lenses of psychology and social psychology, non-rational factors, negotiations and bargaining in the context of organizational management and labour-management relations (Kriesberg L. , 2009).

[10] The first official reference to the concept of security in the United States was in the 1947 National Security Act (Bilgin, Booth, & Jones, 1998)

to issues of societal cohesion and to the relationship between military and non-military threats and vulnerabilities (Buzan & Hansen, 2009).

The Cold War started in the immediate years after the end of the Second World War and was characterized by a bipolar world opposing capitalist states to socialist states, each headed by superpowers, the United States and Soviet Union, respectively. In this period, stability was based on the balance of (nuclear) power and Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD)[11].

The Cold War had four distinct periods regarding the level of tensions in the relations between the superpowers. The first period of nuclear deterrence was characterized by an intensification of tensions and lasted up to the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, the climax of the Cold War[12]. In the second period of détente, there was an alleviation of tensions between the superpowers, from 1962 up to the 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan[13]. The third period experienced increased tensions from 1979 up until 1985, when Mikhail Gorbachev became president of the Soviet Union. The fourth period had an easing of tensions and lasted from 1985 up to the end of the Cold War in 1991 with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, symbolised by the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989.

---

[11] A military strategy doctrine in which the general use of weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, by two or more opposing sides would lead to the complete annihilation of both the attacker and the defender.

[12] Relevant events in the first period are: in Berlin, the Soviet blockade of West Berlin in 1948-1949 and the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961; the Korean War in 1950-1953; the Suez Crisis in 1956, which confirmed bipolarity due to the incapacity of the European powers to be independent from the US, and; the launching of the first artificial satellite - Sputnik - by the Soviet Union in 1957 (Buzan & Hansen, 2009).

[13] The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was the defining situation in a series of events that led to the breakdown of the détente policy between the United States and the Soviet Union. Previously, there had been socialist revolutions in the Horn of Africa (Ethiopia in 1974, Somalia in 1969 and Eritrea in a war of independence since 1962) and Nicaragua in 1978/1979, nationalist conflicts in Namibia since 1966 and Rhodesia/Zimbabwe since 1964, the two Shaba invasions in 1977 and 1978 and the Iranian revolution in 1979.

The fear of confrontation between the superpowers, present throughout the Cold War but especially acute in the first period, led to an IR focus on realistic, rationalist, state-centric hard issues associated with the International Security Studies sub-field of Strategic Studies, which deals with: preventing nuclear war; early warning; conflict escalation and war fighting; the armed forces and the military industrial complex; foreign policy decision-making and international state behaviour.

Around this period in the 1950s and 1960s, the "second great debate" in IR occurred, which focused mainly on methodological issues opposing traditionalist and behaviouralist approaches[14]. Traditional scholars followed the approach of classical political philosophy outlined before. Behaviouralist scholars consider that: the researcher should be neutral, detached from the phenomenon under analysis; theory should rationally explain the behaviour of states (and other actors), identifying causality, and; theory can only be validated through empirical testing, frequently in datasets or case studies[15]. This is considered to be the "scientific revolution" of social sciences, which gained expression in Realist and Liberal IR traditions as well as in other disciplines.

This period is also considered to be the "golden age" of IR, where a sense of fear and urgency over the nuclear threat led to important developments in academic thinking, at a time where civilian scholars had unprecedented funding and access and influence over Western governments' design of foreign and security policies (Williams, 2008).

Behaviourism had a profound effect on how to study conflict. Two developments stand out, one regarding the levels of analysis and another regarding rational choice models. Three levels of analysis are conceptualized to identify the causes of war: the individual, the

---

[14] See Bull (1966) and Kaplan (1966).
[15] The introduction of computers in the 1950s and 1960s helped the studies significantly by allowing the use of large data-sets and statistical models.

national state and the international system (Waltz K. N., 1959; Singer, 1961). "The individual level focuses primarily on human nature and on individual political leaders and their belief systems, psychological processes, emotional states and personalities. The nation-state (or national) level includes factors such as the type of political system (authoritarian or democratic, and variations of each), the structure of the economy, the nature of the policymaking process, the role of public opinion and interest groups, ethnicity and nationalism, and political culture and ideology. The system level includes the anarchic structure of the international system, the distribution of military and economic power among leading states in the system, patterns of military alliances and international trade, and other factors that constitute the external environment common to all states." (Levys, 2011, p. 14).

Rational choice models that analyse and predict superpower behaviour became increasingly popular and sophisticated. Two models can be highlighted: one prescribing cooperation and another defection among states. Gradual Reciprocation in Tension Reduction (GRIT) is a strategy designed to reduce hostilities among conflicting parties and achieve cooperation by one party unilaterally, signalling an intention to cease the conflict dependent on reciprocation from the other party (Osgood, 1962). Within the game theory models, the standard prisoner's dilemma gained significant notoriety by proposing, with a single-play, that the best strategy for two rational individuals might not be collaboration but defection, even if it appears that it is in the best interest of both to cooperate (Rapoport & Chammah, 1965).

Behaviourist approaches had weight in two approaches within ISS: Strategic Studies and Peace Research. At this stage, both approaches share a concern with the security of the state that is threatened by external forces. The core distinction of these approaches is a different normative stance about conflict. While Strategic Studies focus on achieving victory

or avoiding defeat in war, Peace Research focus on identifying the causes of conflict (see table 2 for the periods of Peace Research)[16].

The liberal expectations entrusted to the UN in 1945 to perform an essential role as an institutional mechanism for securing peace were partially thwarted. If on the one hand the UN was able to stabilize interstate relations, on the other hand it was less able to anticipate and deal with intra-state conflict, and it never came to be an autonomous authority for peace as some idealists aspired for.

During the Cold War, the UN faced a deadlock where compromise between the superpowers was morally questionable, and only in the 1990s was the UN furnished with a comprehensive architecture to deal with intra-state conflict.

Throughout the UN's existence, the delegation of a state's authority to a multilateral third party has been beyond consideration, significantly limiting, but not eliminating, the UN's capacity to act as an agent in its own right. A significant event, still to be clarified in the UN's history, was the death of its Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld in 1961 when the plane where he was travelling crashed over Zimbabwe in route to discuss a cease-fire in Congo. Dag Hammarskjöld followed an independent policy regarding the decolonization processes that were unravelling in the African continent at the time and was seen more like a "General" than a secretary of the Security Council.

In the practice of international relations, the principle of collective security, as embodied in the UN, was superseded by the principle of collective defence, wherein a group of states agreed to defend their members from attacks from outside states. Military alliances for collective defence characterized security during the Cold War, opposing the North

---

[16] See Sousa (2017a) for an analysis of Peace Research.

Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the capitalist block established in 1949 to the Warsaw Pact, the socialist block established in 1955.

Even if falling short of the collective security aspiration, in the post-Second World War period several multilateral institutions were established, reaffirming the Liberal perspective of IR. Prime examples include the creation in 1945 of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB), and, in particular, the creation in 1952 of the European Coal and Steel Community, the forerunner of the European Union. The later initiative was the proof that European countries, which had coexisted in a Realist conflict paradigm for centuries, could find common interests to foster stability, revitalizing the Liberal tradition of IR.

The Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 represents the peak of Cold War tensions and its peaceful resolution brought to the forefront the importance of negotiation.

In the aftermath of the crisis, the American President John F. Kennedy adopted the GRIT approach in 1963 and was able to ease tensions with the Soviet Union through negotiations in what would be termed the "Kennedy experiment". The approach paid off and a series of agreements were signed, most notably the Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT) in 1963, and the first round of bilateral Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I) started in 1969, leading to the signing of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty[17] in 1972. This policy of détente was followed by the subsequent American President, Richard Nixon, up until the

---

[17] Other agreements are the hot-line agreement, direct line of communication between the American government and the Soviet government (1963), the peaceful uses of outer space (1967), the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968), the Seabed Arms Control Treaty (1971), the Biological Weapons Convention (1972), and the second rounds of SALT between 1972 and 1979.

end of the 1970s and, although it did not end superpower rivalry, it decreased significantly the risk of war[18].

From the mid-1960s onwards, research in academia has systematically used problem-solving approaches for the negotiation of real conflicts. John Burton organized a series of workshops from the 1960s up to the 1980s. Burton proposed that the problem-solving approach is more than a conflict resolution technique. He considers that social-cultural systems have underlying assumptions that make them more resistant to change than their individual members. When new problems emerge, actors resort to the underlying assumptions, the "default values". This kind of reaction is called first order learning. The transformation of (conflictive) social systems requires second-order learning, a willingness and capacity to challenge underlying assumptions. In order for the transformation of conflict into peace not to be episodic, it requires second-order learning, which can be most effectively achieved through participative design processes (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2011).

Inspired on Burton, in 1965 Herb Kelman started what would later become the Harvard problem-solving programme, which adopts a multidisciplinary approach and focus on intractable conflicts. The programme is ongoing to this day, branching out to also include research, education and training and evolving in the 1980s to propose a "win-win", problem-solving and mutual gains orientation to negotiation (Rogers & Ramsbotham, 1999).

Important developments in the 1960s also occurred within states with civil society movements, often inspired in a non-violent "Satyagraha" approach. In the United States, people sought more power, in a counter culture revolution for Native American rights, civil

---

[18] American President Richard Nixon met with secretary-general of the Soviet Communist Party Leonid I. Brezhnev in Moscow in May of 1972. Nixon also initiated, in the early 1970s, a policy of opening relations with China which led to his meeting in Beijing with Chairman Mao-Tse-Tung in February 1972, a visit Nixon characterized as the "week that changed the world".

rights, women's rights and against the Vietnam War (1954-1975) and nuclear war (Byrne & Senehi, 2009). As people sought to solve their own problems, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) became more popular in the 1960s, with an expansion of community dispute resolution centres in the United States in the 1970s and 1980s (Kriesberg L. , 2009). In Europe, civil society movements embraced similar topics, including the environment, justice and peace issues[19]. The most symbolical of these movements were the 1968 student protests in France and the protests in Prague, Warsaw and Yugoslavia in the socialist block. In academia, these civil society aspirations would gain expression in the field of Peace Research, which emerged at the intersection of peace activism and academic scholarship (Gleditsch, Nordkvelle, & Strand, 2014).

Peace Research emerged in the 1960s in both the US and Europe with the objective of studying the causes of conflict and adopting a behaviourist approach. One of its main scholars was Johan Galtung who, among other contributions, conceptualized Peace as more than the negation of War. War was defined as violent conflict, while negative peace was defined as the absence of violent conflict and positive peace defined not only as the absence of violent conflict but also as a condition where structural violence is removed by achieving social justice and developing non-violent mechanisms for conflict prevention. Violence in "structural violence" was defined as the difference between the "potential" and the "actual". Furthermore, Galtung considers that the researcher should have a normative commitment to social transformation in order to achieve the potential (Galtung, 1969). This proposal answered some of the concerns of peace activism, merging a classical Liberal-Idealist tradition with the Marxist tradition, Marxism of social democracy (Buzan & Hansen, 2009).

[19] In the 1950s and 1960s, there was a Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and in the 1970s and 1980s there were campaigns against the deployment of NATO missiles (Pershing II with nuclear ogives) in five Western European countries (Moita, 1985).

Furthermore, it attempts to refocus the Cold War debate between East and West on the relations between North and South, a shift which gained expression in the 1970s and 1980s.

1970s AND 1980s – THE INTER-PARADIGM DEBATE

By the 1970s there was a general acceptance among IR scholars of the behaviourist arguments, even if its methodological requirements were not followed scrupulously. It is in this context of a winding down of the "second great debate" that the work of Thomas Kuhn (1962) on "research paradigms" would influence the inter-paradigm debate. Kuhn proposed that contributions to the overall body of cumulative knowledge occur in periods of "paradigm agreement". A "paradigm agreement" happens when the scientific community agrees on the validity of a chosen paradigm and focuses on developing knowledge over a particular subject using similar methodologies. In contrast, in periods of "paradigm shift" or "revolutionary phases", scholars focus on gaining theoretical dominance. The periods of "paradigm shift" ensure theoretical innovation but provide less to the cumulative knowledge. Because of the incommensurability of the different theories, the implication for IR is that in order to increase the cumulative body of knowledge the scientific community would be better off to adopt a single paradigm: Realism, Liberalism or Marxism[20] (Kurki & Wight, 2013).

Two developments are illustrative of this period. One is the Neorealism versus Neoliberalism debate and the other is the development of Marxist-Leninist inspired dependency theory.

---

[20] The identification of the paradigms in the inter-paradigm debate varies in the literature, and these include: Liberalism, Realism and radical international relations theories; Realism, Institutionalism and Structuralism; Realist, Pluralist and Marxist or Realism, Pluralism and Globalism.

Kenneth Waltz' book "Theory of International Politics" (1979) is the classic example of Neorealism and conceptualizes the much debated at the time systemic level of analysis. Waltz specifies how the structure of international politics, characterized by the number of great powers, determines the behaviour of states and the expected stability of the world. The focus is on the security of the state and its survival.

The Neoliberal Institutional approach focuses on the transnational relations and on the role that non-governmental actors have in world politics. These transnational non-state actors include multinationals, enterprises and revolutionary movements, trade unions, scientific networks or international organizations. The Neoliberal institutional approach does not reject the centrality of the state but recognises the relevance of transnational non-state actors in the interstate system, in particular on areas of national sovereignty, foreign policy and challenges to international organizations (Keohane & Nye, 1971).

The debate between Neorealists and Neoliberals was not over the nature of the international system, which both consider to be anarchic, but instead over what is the desirable behaviour of states in the international system. Neorealists consider that states should focus on their survival in a self-help and competitive system, while Neoliberals emphasize the importance of cooperation and of new actors and highlight the relevance of international dependency, globalization and international institutions[21].

Dependency theory, inspired in the Marxist-Leninist tradition, can be considered a by-product of the decolonization process. The political independence achieved throughout Asia after the Second World War and in Africa in the 1960s did not equate to economic

---

[21] The English school emerged in the 1970s, merging elements of the Realist and Liberal traditions. It does not question the primacy of the state and power politics and its contribution is to provide an historical perspective and a role for norms in international relations. The main proponents of this school are Hedley Bull (1977) and Martin Wight (1977).

independence in the post-colonial world. Dependency theory emerges in Latin American in the 1960s and 1970s to explain the lack of development of Latin America and other Third World countries (the Global South). The theory considers that what is preventing the development of the Global South is their locked position in a structure of unequal and unfair economic relations with the industrialized countries (the Global North)[22]. In Galtung' terminology, this is a form of structural violence in the North-South relationship.

Some scholars consider that the inter-paradigm debate did not merit the label of a great debate (Wæver O. , 2009), with the main contribution of this debate being that theories acquire some discipline, especially in the debate between Realists and Liberalists. Overall, the inter-paradigm debate distracted scholars away from: the specificities of each of the paradigms; the pursuit of more powerful theories integrating different approaches, and; the valid contributions of some hypotheses associated with the Marxist-Leninist tradition (Levy J. , 1998).

As previously mentioned, the Cold War period of détente ended in 1979 and tensions grew between the superpowers, particularly following the election of Ronald Regan to the presidency of the United States in 1981.

The election of Ronald Regan occurred in the context of broader changes in the world. The economic prosperity of the West during the 1950s and 1960s was based on Keynesian policies implemented by the state aiming at full employment. These policies came to a halt with the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in 1971 (dollar convertibility to gold) and the first oil crisis in 1973 (an increase in 70 per cent in the price of crude oil) (Fouskas, 2003). Keynesian policies would be replaced by economic neoliberal policies (presented

---

[22] This debate also dealt with environmental issues and the ecological impact of industrialized societies and was reflected in the early work of the Group of 77 and the UN Conference on Trade and Development (Rogers & Ramsbotham, 1999).

further ahead in this paper) and geostrategic considerations would change, placing an increased focus on oil producing countries.

Regarding the Cold War divide, the GRIT approach lost political relevance during the 1980s. In 1984, Axelrod proposes another reciprocal strategy, based on the prisoner's dilemma game, which also prescribes cooperation (as with GRIT). The original standard prisoner's dilemma game had prescribed non-cooperation with only one interaction between players. The model was now developed to consider reiterated interactions among players. When the game is played repetitively and the players do not know how many interactions there will be, the best solution is to follow a Tit-For-Tat (TFT) strategy and the best strategy is cooperation (Axelrod, 1984).

But it would be the election of President Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985 that would ease the escalating tensions between superpowers. Gorbachev adopted the "New thinking" in international relations embodied in a set of shared and moral principles to solve global problems, instead of the Marxism-Leninism perspective of irreconcilable conflict between capitalism and socialism (Curtis, 1996). The "New thinking" considers that: human interest is prime to class interest; the world is increasingly more interdependent; no victor can emerge from a nuclear war; security must rest essentially in politics rather than in the military, and; security must be mutual in the context of the two super-powers relations (Holloway, 1988/1989). The "New-thinking" has links to the Non-offensive Defence ideas from German and Peace researchers (Kriesberg L. , 1997). Non-offensive Defence (NoD) is designed to avoid the security dilemma of states by defining a defence strategy with minimal offensive capabilities but a maximum of defence capabilities. As a result of the new policy,

negotiations on arms control become more fruitful after a period of unsuccessful attempts in the early 1980s[23].

Overall, Goldstein and Freeman (1990) identified that GRIT has a better capacity than TFT to explain the de-escalating tensions in the interactions during the Cold War (between 1948 and 1989) between: the United States and the Soviet Union; the United States and the People's Republic of China (PRC), and; the Soviet Union and the PRC.

The "New thinking" also opened the door for the solution of Cold War proxy conflicts, which lead to a growing interest on mediation.

Mediation was promoted in Chapter VI of the UN Charter, which allowed the involvement of third parties in the peaceful settlement of disputes. In the 1970s, Henry Kissinger and Jimmy Carter had already mediated Middle-East conflicts successfully. From the mid-1980s onwards, a more systematic analysis of mediation, linking academic theory and practice, would ensue, with the most recognizable contribution being the developments in the conceptualization of Track I and Track II diplomacy. Track I diplomacy is the official diplomacy between governments done by professional diplomats[24]. In 1981, Track II diplomacy was defined as a conflict resolution mechanism complementary to Track I diplomacy that involves unofficial interactions and interventions by professional non-state actors (Davidson & Montville, 1981)[25]. The concept was further developed in the 1990s into multi-track diplomacy, consisting of nine tracks, essentially expanding Track II to

---

[23] In the early 1980s, the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) talks and Strategic Arms Reductions Talks (START) failed. They were resumed in 1985 alongside talks on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) and led to agreements between 1987 and 1993 to limit the extent and risk associated with nuclear and conventional forces (Buzan & Hansen, 2009).

[24] These could be: informal consultations, "good offices", special envoys, mediation, negotiations, international condemnations, fact-finding missions, and diplomatic and economic sanctions.

[25] These are done basically through workshops and work towards shifts in public opinion.

incorporate the complexities and diversity of actors involved in diplomacy (Diamond & McDonald, 1991; Diamond & McDonald, 1996)[26].

It was in this period where a distinction is made between principled and pragmatic non-violent political struggle. Principled approaches consider the use of peaceful methods for social transformation as a matter of principle, such as in "Satyagraha". Pragmatic approaches consider the use of non-violent methods as a practical or tactical issue, like the one conceptualized in the work of Gene Sharp (1973). Sharp considers that citizens' resistance through non-violent action is a political force because states depend upon the obedience of their citizens. The pragmatic approach to social transformation would inspire social movements worldwide in subsequent decades.

In the 1980s, the standard approaches to the study of war and peace were called into question, not only on the conceptualization of what is studied but also on how it is studied.

In the early 1980s, Barry Buzan's book "People, States and Fear" (1983) proposed a redefinition of the referent object of security. The book challenged the Realist approach centred on the State, Strategy, Science and Status-quo to consider that: security was not only related to the state but also to individuals, nations (human collectivities) and the international, and; that security was more than just military (strategy) but also economic, political and ecological (Williams, 2008). Despite broadening the referent object, Buzan still holds a state-centric perspective on security: he highlights the need to recognize weak-states and strong-

---

[26] The nine tracks are: 1) government or peacemaking through diplomacy; 2) nongovernmental or professional peacemaking through conflict resolution; 3) business, or peacemaking through commerce; 4) private citizen, or peacemaking through personal involvement; 5) research, training and education, peacemaking through learning; 6) activism, or peacemaking through advocacy; 7) religion, or peacemaking through faith in action; 8) funding or peacemaking through providing resources, and; 9) communications and the media, or peacemaking through information. (Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, [accessed 15 March 2016])

states (the former more vulnerable to domestic conflict) and to distinguish high-politics (strategy, military defence) and low-politics (for instance, human rights) (Teixeira, 2011).

In the 1980s, Feminist theory emerged to study how women have different perspectives on war, not as a result of biological determinism but due to the social construction of gender. The theory provides an alternative view to hierarchy and coercive power. The argument is that in alternative (or in conjunction) to the anarchic nature of the inter-state system, it is the patriarchal gendered nature of states, cultures and the world system that explain the persistence of war (Levy J. , 1998). Feminist theory became a research field in its own right in the 1990s, constituting the individual as the referent object of security and adopting a multilevel and multidisciplinary approach (Buzan & Hansen, 2009).

Linguistic and post-structuralist perspectives introduced significant challenges on the way the referent object is to be understood. Linguistic studies highlighted the importance of language and of the discursive representation of the referent object. The objective conceptualization of security is replaced by a subjective constitution of security where actors and identities are no longer fixed but instead produced and reproduced.

Poststructuralism constitutes the most extreme rejection of positivism, which is the epistemological standing of standard IR schools (see next section on positivism). Poststructuralism critique of positivism is based on the fact that the positivist mind "cannot acknowledge the framing paradigm it has created. It confuses the given cosmos with the worldview it has generated to shape the given. It cannot see that the ground on which it stands to frame its world, is its own creation. It thus tends toward immodesty, intolerance and the oppression of scientism. (…) postmodern poststructuralism, derived from the deconstruction of Derrida (1976; 1981), holds that there are no transcendental grounds for truth outside the text" (Heron & Reason, 1997, p. 274). For Poststructuralism, all phenomena

only exist through a discursive representation and therefore its constitution is permeated by the lenses of the relations of power where the constitution of the identity of the "Other" as threatening is intrinsically linked to the constitution of the identity of the "Self" (Buzan & Hansen, 2009).

1990s TO THE PRESENT – RATIONALISM VERSUS REFLECTIVISM

The end of the Cold War in 1991 marked the transition from a bipolar world to a unipolar American world, which opened possibilities for new conceptualizations of international politics. The republican George W. Bush senior (American president between 1989 and 1993) and initially the democrat Bill Clinton (American president between 1993 and 2001) followed a policy of "assertive multilateralism" aimed at United States leadership but with the support of multilateralism, in particular of the UN. The policy constituted a "pragmatic idealism" that merged the power politics of Realism with human rights, democracy and multilateral conflict resolution of Liberalism. The term "assertive multilateralism" was coined by Madeleine Albright (United States Ambassador to the UN between 1993 and 1997 and Secretary of State between 1997 and 2001) and the policy was viewed both as a way to reduce costs, casualties and American exposure to overseas deployments as well as a "peace dividend" derived from the end of the Cold War. The underlying idea was that the United States did not have the resources, or will, to be the police force of the world and it was in its foreign policy interest to form and lead coalitions, establish its goals and ensure its success. Notwithstanding, this policy considers that the United States could act unilaterally in cases of self-defence or in defence of its vital interests (Boys, 2012).

The coalition that intervened, with the UN Security Council's approval, in the Gulf War in 1990 and 1991 is the best example of this new policy. The intervention refocused attention to issues of regional security and reaffirmed American military supremacy. But the failed American military intervention in Somalia in 1993 in support of a UN effort for nation building meant an end of American bipartisanship support for "assertive multilateralism" and for American direct involvement in conflicts that are not part of its national interest.

An alternative policy to "assertive multilateralism" was formulated in the "Defense Planning Guidance" for the fiscal years 1994-1999, unofficially known as the "Wolfowitz doctrine" as it was authored by, at the time, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Paul Wolfowitz serving under U.S. Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney. The policy considered that the United States' first objective was to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival. In practice, this means to prevent a hostile power from taking "control" of a region with sufficient resources to generate global power. The regions considered were: Western Europe, East Asia, the territory of the former Soviet Union, and Southwest Asia[27]. The second objective of the policy was the promotion of American values, to "address sources of regional conflict and instability in such a way as to promote increasing respect for international law, limit international violence and encourage the spread of democratic forms of government and open economic systems". This objective is particularly relevant in issues and regions that are important for the security of the United States, their friends and allies. Relevant issues include "proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles, threats to U.S. citizens from terrorism or regional or local conflict, and threats to U.S. society from narcotics trafficking". Relevant regions are the ones close to the United States, such as Latin America,

---

[27] Additional aspects to this objective included that the US would show enough leadership to establish and maintain the new order, in a way that would inhibit potential challengers from aspiring to having a greater regional or global role both in economic and military terms.

and regions with raw materials, in particular the Persian Gulf for its oil (The New York Times, 1992). The document makes no reference to multilateral initiatives through the UN, considers the possibility of ad hoc coalitions formed to deal with a particular crisis and that the US should be able to act unilaterally when coalitions cannot be secured.

Rejected in 1992 by George W. Bush senior after it was leaked to the press on March 7 1992, the policy was rewritten before being officially released on April 16 of the same year. During the Clinton administration (1993-2001), policies similar to the "Wolfowitz doctrine" were advocated by the neoconservative think-tank "Project for the New American Century" founded in 1997. Many of the advocates of this policy would be part of the republican administration of George W. Bush junior, president between 2001 and 2009.

These policies are linked to academic debates over a possible peace dividend derived from the demise of the ideological competition of the Cold War and the possibility of new sources of war based on identities.

The demise of the Soviet Union and of the authoritarian socialist option lead to the hegemony of liberal democracy. Liberal democracy had become the "only game in town" and, for this reason, this period could be considered an "end of history" moment (Fukuyama, 1989). Furthermore, democratic peace theory proposes that as more and more states become liberal democracies, wars become less frequent because war between mature democracies is more unlikely (Doyle, 1983; 1986).

In contrast with this peace dividend, the "clash of civilizations" hypothesis proposes that cultural and religious identities would be the main source of conflict in the post-Cold War era (Huntington S. P., 1993; 1996). According to this hypothesis, the central axis of conflict would be between Western and non-Western civilizations and that conflict can be particularly prevalent between Muslims and non-Muslims. Furthermore, it considers that in

order to preserve the Western civilization, in the context of declining Western power, the United States and Europe should, among other initiatives, "maintain Western technological and military superiority over other civilizations" (1996; 310), promote Western political values and institutions associated with human rights and democracy and protect the cultural, social and ethnic integrity of Western societies (1996; 185).

More broadly, two schools of thinking within Neorealism advocate different potential roles for the United States. Defensive neorealism considers that a distinction needs to be made in state relations between friends and enemies, having in mind the high costs of war. Furthermore, Kenneth Waltz (1979) considers that the primary objective of states is to maintain security in an anarchic system, which is best achieved through moderate foreign policies.

Offensive Neorealism considers that states maintain their security in an anarchic system by maximizing their power and influence, that the relative power of states is more important than absolute power and that a state must be ready to defend its relative advantage by force if necessary. The policy implications are for a state to pursue power and for great powers to pursue domination and hegemony. A great power should increase its power in relation to the power of potential rival states (Mearsheimer, 2001). From an American geostrategic perspective, it is argued that no power should emerge in Eurasia, as it would be able to challenge America's position in the world (Brzezinski, 1997). Eurasia accounts for 75 per cent of the world's population, 60 per cent of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and 75 per cent of its energy resources (Fouskas, 2003).

In the aftermath of the September 11 attacks in 2001, the foreign policy of the sole superpower became firmly rooted in offensive Neorealism. The American National Security Strategy published in September 2002 bore resemblances to the "Project for the New

American Century", clearly stating that "our forces will be strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military build-up in hopes of surpassing, or equalling, the power of the United States" (2002, p. 30). Furthermore the September 11 attacks placed terrorism at the top of the IR agenda and the "Global War on Terror" replaced the "Cold War" as the "central organizing issue for international security" (Buzan & Hansen, 2009).

Despite this change, the classical concerns of the Realist and Liberal approaches over strategic studies, arms control, liberal peace or negative peace outlived both the end of the Cold War and the September 11 attacks. Such is also the case with topics like the balance of power, hegemony, international rivalries, conflict issues, territory, bargaining, deterrence, societal-level analysis (democratic peace, leaders, institutions), ideas and culture, decision-making by individuals and organizations, reputation, signalling and conflict, escalation and de-escalation of conflict, civil wars, environment and migration. Also Marxist inspired approaches continued to focus on economic and trade issues (Levy J. S., 2015).

In the 1990s, liberal peace evolved from its 1980s orthodox neoliberal focus on trickle-down economics and market-led sustained economic growth implemented through Structural Adjustment programmes. Neoliberal policies, with a focus on the free market, shrinking of state bureaucracy and elimination of state regulations (Jackson & Sorensen, 1999, p. 201) had started in the 1980s with the election of Ronald Regan in the United States in 1981 and Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom in 1979.

In the early 1990s, a series of factors lead to a crisis in the World Bank, one of the main promoters of these policies. Evidence suggested that free markets might not work as efficiently as prescribed and state regulation and investments in education had partly explained the success of the East Asian Tigers. Also the poor success record of adjustment programmes in Africa brought to light the need for specific initiatives that ameliorate the

negative consequences (specifically poverty) of the structural adjustment programmes. Additionally, Mexico, a main reference in the implementation of structural adjustments, went into crisis in 1994. As a result, in the late 1990s the World Bank adopted the "Comprehensive Development Framework" based on a human poverty approach, moving away from a focus on income to a focus on human capabilities, as represented in the Human Development Index, which is based on the nutritional status, educational attainment, and health status (Pender, 2001).

Interventions by the development and aid industry include now forms of bottom-up development and targeted interventions like: the promotion of small and medium enterprises; the informal sector; "fair trade"; the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); poverty reduction programmes, and; participatory development. The liberal peace was to mean not only the liberal democracy and market economics of the 1980s but also human rights, rule of law and development from the 1990s onwards.

The liberal peace policies are promoted worldwide through the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization and in countries with conflict with the support of a new machinery for conflict management and resolution anchored in the UN. The 1992 Agenda for Peace outlined the way the UN would respond to conflict in the post-Cold-War through a broad machinery for crisis prevention, peace-keeping, peace-making and post-settlement peace-building.

The new UN mandate is built on Realist-Liberal foundations. The focus is on the internal threats to state security (intra-state conflict had become the most relevant type of conflict with a peak of occurrences in 1993) and follows an "apolitical" problem-solving approach, negotiating the liberal peace with states to find acceptable solutions for the cessation of direct violence. In Galtun's terminology, the focus is on a transition from war

to negative peace but short of reaching positive peace, which would require addressing structural violence through a more transformative approach.

This would mark the start of a new period of activity for the UN, previously locked by the Cold War. The early 1990s saw an exponential increase in UN involvement in conflicts, followed by a sharp decrease in 1995, in the aftermath of the failed Somalia interventions of 1994, and low level of involvement up to 2000. From 2000 onwards, the number of troops and budget of the UN has increased significantly and steadily each year.

The comprehensiveness of approaches is also reflected in CR, which adopts a multidimensional approach to conflict, which means: to operate at different levels of analysis (intergroup, interstate, regional or global); in different sectors (psychological, economic, social, political), and; with a significant increase of Non-Governmental Organizations' (NGO) involvement both through transnational social movements[28] and directly in specific conflict resolution processes[29]. Overall, CR thinking and practice focuses on: the increased complexity of conflict; issues of asymmetry between the actors; cultural and religious diversity, and; conflict intractability (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2011).

New approaches emerged to challenge Neorealism and Neoliberalism ontologically and epistemologically, which are criticized for being biased towards the state, the capitalist market and the status quo (Baylis, Smith, & Owens, 2008).

Two dichotomies group the different approaches: the rationalist versus reflectivist approaches and the positivist versus post-positivism approaches. Rationalist approaches use

---

[28] For instance, Search for Common Ground, International Alert, the West African Network for Peacebuilding, the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes, the Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, the European Centre for Conflict Prevention, or the International Crisis Group (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2011).

[29] For instance, the Community of Sant'Egidio in Mozambique (1992), Carter Center in Venezuela (since 1996), Center for Humanitarian Dialogue in Darfur (since 2001), Crisis Management Initiative in Aceh (2005), and Sustained Dialogue in Tajikistan (1993-2005) (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2011).

rational-choice theory to identify law, like cause and effect mechanisms that explain the behaviour of actors. Reflectivist approaches consider that decisions are context dependent and preferences of actors are not fixed as they are determined by values, norms and ideas that vary in time and place. Because of reflexivity in social action, there is a bidirectional relationship between cause and effects. Therefore, research should not only explain but most importantly understand the intersubjective meanings and discourses that inform the behaviour of actors (Keohane R. O., 1988). The main distinction that differentiates positivist and post-positivist scholarship is the assumption that the researcher has the capacity to be a neutral observer of the phenomenon under analysis, like it is proposed by positivist scholars. For post-positivist scholars, the researcher is never detached from the reality or able to be neutral from the historical and situated social paradigm in which he or she is living (Lapid, 1989).

By and large, Neorealist and Neoliberal approaches are rationalist and positivist, while the new approaches have different degrees of reflectivism and post-positivism. Moreover, reflectivism and in particular post-positivism call into question the Khunian understanding of science in its view of a cumulative development of knowledge within one accepted paradigm. Instead, some post-positivists consider that there are competing, equally valid, accounts of the same phenomenon, therefore there is valid knowledge in the same period emanating from different paradigms.

The reflectivist and post-positivist approaches that had an expression in the 1980s in the fields of Feminism, Linguistics and Post-structuralism gained further expression in the 1990s in five novel approaches: Constructivism, Post-Colonialism, Human Security, Critical Security Studies and the Copenhagen School.

Constructivism is a prime example of a reflectivist approach that takes into account not only the politics of material capability and utility but, most importantly, the structure of ideas, culture, norms and identities that condition the behaviour of agents. A distinction can be made between conventional and critical constructivism. In Conventional Constructivism, the agency for order and peace is significantly associated with the state (its main referent object), with limited recognition of institutional or individual agency, and conventional constructivism adopts a "soft-positivist" epistemology[30]. In Critical Constructivism, agency is afforded to collectivities (the main referent object) and adopts a narrative and sociological post-positivist epistemology. A distinction can also be made regarding its normative orientation, with the European constructivist approaches (like Critical Security Studies or the Copenhagen School) more committed to a normative Peace Research agenda and the less normative US constructivism approach (Buzan & Hansen, 2009). Peace Research Constructivism is concerned with explaining the link between the social construction of identity (frequently associated with ethno-linguistic groups), the political mobilization of that identity and civil violence as the outcome of this process (Sambanis, 2002).

Broadly speaking, the term "post-colonial" refers to how three-quarters of the current world population have their lives shaped by the experience of imperialism, from the moment of colonization until the present time (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2002). Post-Colonialism emerges in the 1970s with a focus on the sociological, economic and cultural aspects of the colonial experience and has sought to theoretically challenge "the grand march of western historicism with its encouragement of binaries (self-other, metropolis-colony, centre-periphery, among others)" (McClintock, 1992, p. 85). Furthermore, it highlights the ethnocentricity of security studies during the Cold War with its exclusive focus on the

---

[30] Therefore, convention constructivism is an exceptional case of a reflectivist approach that is positivist.

security of the West (Teixeira, 2011). Post-colonial theory crystallizes in the 1990s, drawing from a broad range of perspectives. With links to the critical constructivist school, it highlights the security specificity of the Third World shaped by the unequal relationship with the colonial and post-colonial West. Based on Poststructuralism, it highlights the Western construction of a "subaltern" or "inferior" "Other", be it the "Southern", "Oriental", "underdeveloped", "failed" or "fragile" state (the "West and the Rest"). The specificity of the post-colonial world is brought to the forefront, which translates into the questioning of: the "Westphalia" state as the referent object; the concept of security itself, which is not only military but also significantly economic and associated with external as well as internal threats, and; the epistemologies and methodologies used, for example with calls for the use of anthropology (Buzan & Hansen, 2009).

In 1994, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) introduced the concept of Human Security both with a problem-solving academic concern and a policy prescription orientation. The concept of "Common Security", coined by the "Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues" chaired by Olof Palme in 1982, and "comprehensive security" were the forerunners of Human Security in the 1980s (Westing, 1989). "Common Security" linked the international and national security (arms control agenda) to broader issues associated with the livelihood of individuals across the world (related to the economy and the environment), while the "comprehensive security" considers the environment as an important component of security[31].

In Human Security, the referent object is the individual instead of the state, and security is related to the welfare of people rather than to the military sector. The broader

---

[31] Previously, the concept of "Security Communities" (Deutsch, 1957) had been defined as a region where war is unlikely to occur.

conceptualization of human security expands the narrow focus on violent threats to identify seven natures of threats: economic; food; health; environment; personal physical violence; community cultural and other types of violence, and; political human rights. This encompassing definition of Human Security is the most broadening concept since Galtun's "structural violence", with an explicit objective of linking security to what is seen as its other half: development (Collective, 2006).

In the 1990s, three reflectivist and critical schools developed in Europe, providing an alternative to the American (and also European) rationalist "value-free" thinking, in particular within the area of security studies. These have been characterized as the Aberystwyth, Copenhagen and Paris "schools" (Wæver O. , 2004), even if they are disperse locations more representative of individuals and debates than unitary schools of thought (Collective, 2006). These "schools" are considered "critical", as they share the understanding that socio-political processes inform knowledge and that there are normative political choices in the social sciences. Critical theory is essentially emancipatory politics with knowledge focused on social and political transformation. It is distinguishable from Liberal-Idealism by also explaining critically the existing political system (Viotti & Kauppi, 2012).

Critical Security Studies emerged in the 1990s and became institutionalized in Europe, normally inspired in the "Frankfurt" school of the inter-war period and post 1960s. At its core is a challenge to the Realism military-focused, state-centred and zero-sum understanding of security, which is to be replaced by a project of human emancipation (Collective, 2006). It identifies the individual as the referent object of security, considering that the state and the Neoliberal economic structures have the potential to be sources of insecurity (Buzan & Hansen, 2009). It takes a more political, critical and normative stance, where "security" is inter-subjectively created, dependent on political perspectives and

worldviews (Booth, 1997). The Aberystwyth (or Welsh) "school" development of this thinking would put a focus on the emancipation of individuals, whereby individuals are to be emancipated from constrains, in particular the constraint of war and the threat of war.

The Copenhagen school re-formulates the referent object of security as "society", a middle ground between the state-centred and the "individual" or "global" (Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup, & Lemaitre, 1993). This change allowed the study of "identity security" and situations where the state and societies were not harmoniously matched, for example when minorities are threatened by the state (Buzan & Hansen, 2009). The concept of security is further expanded to include military, political, societal, economic, and environmental dimensions. With a focus on the development of new concepts, it introduced the concept of "regional security complexes" to refer to a phenomenon where different units (or societies) have their security processes so interlinked that they cannot be analysed or resolved separately, constituting mutually exclusive geographical regions. The most innovative contribution came with "securitization theory", which defines security as a speech act. "Securitization" is defined as the process in which an actor, through discourse, constitutes an issue, another actor or a phenomenon as a threat to a referent object (state, society or individual). The successful "securitization" legitimizes exceptional actions in the name of ("national") security that would not be consented otherwise (Waever, 1995; Buzan, Waever, & Wilde, 1998).

The Paris school draws on the discursive conceptualization of security of the Copenhagen school but focuses instead on the everyday practices of security, not understanding security as a response to exceptional circumstances like in the Copenhagen school. Adopting a Poststructuralist approach, it emphasizes the institutionalization of security, with a focus on the security practices of the state –"security state"-, the security

professionals, the government rationality of security, and the security technology and knowledge (Collective, 2006)[32]. Didier Bigo is a central reference of the Paris school, adding a sociological perspective to the analysis of "securitization" inspired in Pierre Bourdieu[33].

Also within CR, new approaches emerged after the 1990s, in particular the cosmopolitan conflict resolution approach focusing on humanity and on dealing with conflict from a local level up to the global level. Transformative cosmopolitanism rejects the "hegemonic" interest prevalent in the promotion of unquestioned "universal values", like liberal peace, and instead aims at the inclusive integration at local and global levels that can result in human welfare and emancipation worldwide (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2011). Cosmopolitan conflict resolution is linked to the concept of cosmopolitan democracy, which is defined by global social justice, democracy, universal human rights, human security, rule of law, and transnational solidarity and requires transformations at the governance, economic and security levels (Baylis, Smith, & Owens, 2008).

A paradigm that has the potential to frame CR further into accepted academic practices is the participatory/cooperative paradigm. Work on a participatory paradigm extends back to the 1960s but it gained further acceptance in academia in the 1990s (Guba & Lincoln, 2000). The paradigm considers that: reality is participative, a subjective-objective reality co-created by the mind in a given cosmos; epistemology is experiential, propositional and with practical ways of knowing; methodology is based on political participation in collaborative action inquiry, and; axiology is based on the primary value of practical knowing at the service of human flourishing.

---

[32] Due to the closeness of the Paris school to the Copenhagen school, one considers the former as a branch of the latter.
[33] I thank Gilberto Carvalho de Oliveira for this comment.

CR is distinctive from other approaches mainly due to its practice, merging the role of researcher with the role of practitioner (or politician), for example in long political processes of problem solving or mediation. The participatory paradigm formulates the difference between propositional and presentational knowledge (which is based on experimental knowledge) and experimental knowledge itself. Thus, the participatory paradigm advocates for a radical empiricism distinct from behaviourism, which is considered not to be empirical enough (Heron & Reason, 1997).

CONCLUSION

The paper provides an account of one century of International Relations thinking about peace and conflict. The classical conceptualization of what IR studies in terms of security centred on the state, the military and external threats have been recurrently questioned by new conceptualizations that extend it to other actors (individuals, groups, societies, civilizations), to other sectors (economic, political, social, environmental) and internal sources of conflict. The classical approach of how IR scholars undertake research based on positivism and rationalism is put into question by a set of epistemological post-positivist and reflectivist approaches. None of the four IR debates meant the end to one paradigm and the scientific study of peace and conflict at the beginning of the 21st century became populated by different paradigms. CR approaches are part of and reflect these developments in IR and ISS, becoming more comprehensive in its approaches and also developing alternative emancipatory proposals for conflict resolution.

Barry Buzan (1991) encapsulates the two World Wars, the decolonization processes and the Cold War as a historical period. He proposes that the twenty-first century started in 1989 (or 1991), which is much more similar to the 19th century in the sense that among the great powers there is no major ideological or power rivalry. There is a rise of a multipolar power structure replacing the Cold War's bipolar one, which has the US as the superpower but alongside regional powers: the European Community, Russia, India, China, and Japan. This multipolarity gravitates around the US and is dominated at the centre by a capitalist security community comprised of Europe, North America, Japan and Australia[34].

Buzan (1991) considers that the periphery countries (states that are not major powers or part of the capitalist security community) face five security issues: political, military, economic, societal, and environmental. Politically periphery countries are less relevant without a great-power rivalry, authoritarian states less legitimized without the Soviet Union, governments more accountable for their performance without the fading justification of the colonization legacy, colonial borders also more questionable and, with the demise of communism, Islam maybe pushed to assume the opposition to Western hegemony. Militarily developments are dependent on either the establishment of a global collective security regime with the United Nations Security Council (UN SC) working as a clearing house and legitimator of military interventions, or on the centre disengaging from the periphery, leaving it to its own devices (with the exception of the oil rich Middle East) where regional rivalries and power balances might lead local powers to reshape the political environment in the regions. In both scenarios, arms control and the nuclear non-proliferation regime will be particularly relevant for centre and periphery countries. Economically, the new era in

---

[34] Security community is a group of states that do not expect, or prepare for, the use of military force in their relations with each other.

international relations and the periphery countries' access to resources, finance and markets is not expected to change their condition of peripheral countries. Societal security, defined as the threats and vulnerabilities that affect patterns of communal identity and culture, will be mainly on migration issues (in particular from the periphery to the centre countries) and on the clash of rival civilizational identities, the cultural colonization of the periphery by the centre but also of immigrant communities of the periphery in the centre and the potential for terrorism. The latter is more significant in the clash between the West and Islam, wherein Europe would be in the frontline, a potential for conflict that is significantly dependent on the performance of moderate governments within the Islamic world. Finally, environmental security will become more and more relevant to all states and to the centre-periphery relations as the density of the human population on the planet increases.

From the United States standpoint, closer to defensive neorealism, in 1999 the world security in the 21st century is defined by: increasing vulnerability to attacks on their homeland that cannot be prevented by American military superiority; rapid advances in information and biotechnology; new technologies that will divide the world as well as draw it together (for example, the Internet and access to knowledge); vulnerabilities of the global economic infrastructure; the strategic significance of energy; the porosity of borders; the pressures over the sovereignty of states; the fragmentation or failure of states with destabilizing effects on neighbouring states; atrocities in the world and the deliberate terrorizing of civilian populations; the importance of space, which will become a competitive military environment; the continuation of the essence of war with new actors and weapons; more challenges to US intelligence; the United States being called upon frequently to intervene militarily in a time of uncertain alliances and with the prospect of fewer forward-deployed forces, and; the need for different American military and national capabilities (USCNS/21, 1999). These

considerations can be contrasted with the offensive Neorealist concerns of the American thinkers presented before.

More generally, at a systemic level security threats can be identified: in the return of great power conflict with the rise of China and India, return of Russia and the Japanese dilemma; in climate change; in the uneven development in the world; in the consequences of overpopulation, migration and pandemics; resources shortage (water, food, energy and land); nuclear proliferation and war, and; terrorism (Gray, 2006). Accordingly, the root causes of conflict and insecurity are likely to be climate change, competition over resources, marginalization of the majority of the world and global militarization (Abbott, Rogers, & Sloboda, 2006).

Within only a decade and a half since the first assessments, some of the threats of the new century have already unfolded. But developments seem to suggest that it is too early to tell if the 21st century will not be marked by ideological rivalry between democracy and autocracy (as it occurred between liberalism versus fascism and communism in the 20th century) and in which way, if any, emerging powers will challenge the United States.

Regarding the challenge to the United States, it is still not clear which polarity replaced the bipolarity of the Cold War. The United States is considered to be the one indispensable actor for global security issues but its involvement is not sufficient, wherein the buy-in of regional powers is also required when the issues are also of their interest. How the aspirations of the emerging powers, and in particular of China, will play out will determine the patterns of conflict and cooperation in the world. The policy followed by the United States will significantly set the stage: to have a defensive Neorealism alongside some form of "assertive multilateralism" or an offensive Neorealism alongside a "Global War on Terror"

will have different repercussions globally in terms of security and approaches to conflict resolution.

The tension in accommodating the "new" power configurations is most clearly illustrated in the freeze of the UN SC reform in 2005, apparently limiting the possibility to have a stronger global collective security regime centred in the UN SC. But new and unexpected accommodations of power interests may develop in the 21st century.

In Africa, the first multilateral organization mainly focused on the internal security threats of its member states takes shape in the African Union's (AU) with its African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA). Since it was founded in 2001, less than two decades ago, the AU managed to "negotiate" a role for itself in the global security system centred in the UN SC, a role that equates to the regionalization of security in Africa with the right to military intervention in conflicts while awaiting UN SC authorization (Sousa R. R., 2017b). Even if no country in Africa is a major contender to US supremacy, or because of it, international disengagement from the region led to regional cooperative efforts for security despite regional rivalries and power balances, a process that could unfold in other regions.

If a trend can be identified in the evolution of paradigms and approaches to the study of peace and conflict during the 20th century, is that there is an initial search for a better science with the behaviouralist revolution. Grounded in positivism and rationalism, it reinforces the Newtonian approach in the social sciences, looking to identify the "laws of nature" and causality in the phenomenon analysed. This approach deepened throughout the decades and Khun's view of science led scholars to attempt, unsuccessfully, to identify the best set of "laws of nature" in the inter-paradigm debate. This Newtonian approach contributed significantly to our knowledge, understanding and handling of the phenomenon of peace and conflict.

But some disappointment with the knowledge formulated resulted, in the later part of the century, in the emergence of new approaches in the social sciences. These approaches are embedded in relativism, which considers that the phenomenon presents itself differently depending on the view point and paradigms used or on who is the observer. They question Khun's view of science in the sense that each "competing" paradigm has an intrinsic value.

The reflectivist and post-positivist approaches are examples of this attempt to better understand the world. Another example is the possible emergence of a non-Western IR theory, in particular one based on the Asian experience. Research in this area is ongoing and can be considered "pre-theoretical" (Acharya & Buzan, 2007). However, the distinctiveness of these newly emerging Asian IR communities of scholars might come from a new critical edge as, by and large, these scholars adopt a positivist approach (Eun, 2016).

Furthermore, some scholars consider that relativity is not enough to explain the phenomenon and propose post-Newtonian approaches in an attempt to offer a better explanation. This is the case of complexity theory and quantum theory, which are in fact interlinked. Buzan and Hansen (2009) consider, after reviewing the evolution of International Security Studies, that developments or challenges to current approaches might come from socio-biology and quantum social theory.

Complexity Theory considers that the machine clockwork Newtonian view of the world should be replaced by an organic, holistic and ecological view of the world determined not by separate parts, but by a unified whole created from the relations between its separate units, as in a system. The properties of a system are different from the properties of a machine. "Machines are controlled and determined by their structure and characterized by linear chains of cause and effect. They are constructed from well-defined parts that have specific functions and tasks. Systems, on the other hand, are analogous to organisms. They

grow and are process-oriented. Their structures are shaped by this orientation and they can exhibit a high degree of internal flexibility. Systems are characterized by cyclical patterns of information flow, non-linear interconnections and self-organization within defined limits of autonomy. Moreover, using the analogy of an organism, a system is concerned with self-renewal. This is important, since while a machine carries out specific and predictable tasks, a system is primarily engaged in a process of renewal and, if necessary, self-transformation." (Duffield M. , 2001, p. 10).

Quantum Social Theory is based on quantum physics rather than on classical physics. Quantum Social Theory proposes that human consciousness, and therefore human subjectivity, is a macroscopic quantum mechanical phenomena. Human beings are "walking wave functions" and their actions constituting society are also a quantum phenomenon. Properties of quantum mechanisms at sub-atomic level are distinct from classical physics: phenomena are entangled; can have contradictory properties, be indefinite and non-deterministic, and; there can be non-local causation. This proposal calls into question classical physics and consequently positivist and post-positivists approaches in social science. Positivism assumes that the human being is a machine with a deterministic law-governed behaviour that can be studied objectively without taking consciousness into account. Post-positivists (interpretative) reject the machine model and the objectivity of the researcher and object of research, making conscience central. Nevertheless, they accept the classical Cartesian dualism of mind and body, which assume that a mental phenomenon is non-physical and there is a separation between mind (consciousness) and body (brain) (Wendt, 2015).

Wendt's proposal of a Quantum Social Theory has been received with interest by some scholars (Alekseeva, Mineev, & Loshkariov, 2016; Trnka & Lorencová, 2016; Wagner

& Gebauer, 2008) but met with scepticism among both social sciences scholars (IR included) (Woolley, 2015; Riche, 2012) and exact science scholars (Moriarty, 2016). It is too early to tell what will be the repercussions of this line of inquiry, but it has the potential to reformulate social constructivism and social sciences, IR included, and trigger a great debate between the classic and quantic in the social sciences.

Annex 1 – Evolution of International Security Studies, Peace Research and Conflict Resolution

20th and 21st centuries	1919 to 1940s	1950s	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990s	Since 2000
Great debates in IR	Realism versus Idealism (1930s and 1940s)	Traditionalism versus Behaviourism		Inter-paradigm debate between Realism, Liberalism and Marxist		Rationalists versus reflectivists	
International Security Studies Buzan and Hansen (2009)		Strategic studies, since 1940s and 1950s	Arms control, Liberal peace, Negative and Positive Peace, Marxist Peace Since the 1960s		Common security, Feminism, Poststructuralism Since 1980s	Post-Cold War traditionalism, conventional and critical constructivism, post-colonialism, human security, critical security studies, Copenhagen school, since the 1990s	
Peace Research Gledistch (2008)	Pre-history before 1959		Behaviouralist revolution 1959-1968	Socialist revolution, 1968-1978	The wilderness years, 1979-1989	Post-Cold War years as the liberal peace, 1990-2001	Clash of civilizations? – since 2001
Peace Research Sousa (2017a)			Inter-state (nuclear) conflict, behaviourist Late 1950s- late 1960s	Inter-state conflict, positive and negative peace, structural violence, behaviourist and normative research, late 1960s-late 1980s		Inter and intra state conflict, liberal peace, rationalist positivist (behaviourist), Since late 1980s	
Conflict Resolution	Precursors before 1945	Founders, 1945-1965		Consolidators, 1965-1985		The reconstructors, 1985-2005	

20th and 21st centuries	1919 to 1940s	1950s	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990s	Since 2000
Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall (2011)							
Conflict Resolution Kriesberg (2009)	Preliminary developments, 1914 and 1945	Laying the groundwork, 1946-1969		Expansion and institutionalization, 1970-1989		Diffusion and differentiation,1990-2008	
Conflict Analysis and Resolution (CAR) Byrne and Senehi (2009)			"Power to the people" movement- 1960s	Professionalization of the field – 1970s	Structural roots of conflict, basic human needs and the connection between micro and macro levels of interventions, 1980s		Conflict transformation and peace and conflict studies, 2000-2010

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, C., Rogers, P., & Sloboda, J. (2006). *Global Responses to Global Threats: Sustainable Security for the 21st Century.* Oxford: Oxford Research Group.

Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (2007). Why is there no non-Western international relations theory? An introduction. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, 7*, 287-312. doi:10.1093/irap/lcm012

Alekseeva, T., Mineev, A., & Loshkariov, I. (2016). «Land of Confusion»: Quantum Physic In IR Theory? *MGIMO Review of International Relations, 48*(3).

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2002). *The Empires Wrties Back. Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures.* London and New York: Routledge.

Axelrod, R. (1984). *the Evolution of Cooperation.* New York: Basic Books Inc.

Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (2008). *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Booth, K. (1997). Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist. Em K. Krause, & M. C. Williams, *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases* (pp. 83-119). London: UCL Press.

Boys, J. (2012). A Lost Opportunity: The Flawed Implementation of Assertive Multilateralism (1991-1993). *European journal of American studies, 7*(1), 1-14.

Brzezinski, Z. (1997). *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives.* New York : Basic Books.

Buzan, B. (1983). *People, States, and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations.* University of Michigan: Wheatsheaf Books.

Buzan, B. (1991). New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-First Century. *International Affairs, 67*(3), 431-451.

Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009). *The evolution of international security studies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B., Waever, O., & Wilde, J. d. (1998). *Security a New Framework for Analysis.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Byrne, S., & Senehi, J. (2009). Conflict analysis and resolution as a multidiscipline. Em D. J. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste, & J. Senehi, *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution* (pp. 45-58). New York: Routledge.

Collective, C. (December de 2006). Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto. *Security Dialogue, 37*, 443-487. doi:10.1177/0967010606073085

Curtis, G. (. (1996). *Russia: A Country Study.* Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress.

Davidson, W. D., & Montville, J. V. (1981). Foreign Policy According to Freud. *45*.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Derrida, J. (1981). *Positions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Diamond, L., & McDonald, J. (1991). Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Guide and Analysis. *Occasional Paper 3*.

Diamond, L., & McDonald, J. W. (1996). *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace.* West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Doyle, M. W. (Summer de 1983). Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs. *Philosophy & Public Affairs, 12*(3), 205-235.

Doyle, M. W. (December de 1986). Liberalism and World Politics. *The American Political Science Review, 80*(4), 1151-1169.

Duffield, M. (2001). *Global governance and the new wars, the merging of development and security.* London and New York: Zed books.

Eun, Y. (2016). *Pluralism and Engagement in the Discipline of International Relations.* Singapore: Springer .

Fouskas, V. (2003). *Zones of Conflict. US Foreign Policy in the Balkans and hte Greater Middle East.* London: Pluto Press.

Fukuyama, F. (Summer de 1989). The End of History. *The National Interest*, pp. 3-18.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of peace research, 6*(3), 167-191.

Gleditsch, N. P. (3 de June de 2008). An irreverent history of peace research. Berlin.

Gleditsch, N. P., Nordkvelle, J., & Strand, H. (2014). Peace research - Just the study of war? *Journal of Peace Research*, 145-158.

Goldstein, J. S., & Freeman, J. R. (1990). *Three-Way Street. Strategic Reciprocity in World Politics.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Gray, C. (2006). *Security Threats in the 21st Century.* UK: University of Reading.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. Em N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln, *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research (3rd-ed)* (pp. 163-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heron, J., & Reason, P. (1997). A Participatory Inquiry Paradigm. *Qualitative Inquiry, 3*(3), 274-294.

Herz, J. (1951). *Political Realism and Political Idealism: A Study in Theories and Realities.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Holloway, D. (1988/1989). Gorbachev's New Thinking. *Foreign Affairs, 68*(1), pp. 66-81.

Huntington, S. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* New York : Simon & Schuster.

Huntington, S. P. (Summer de 1993). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs, 72*(3), pp. 22-49.

Jackson, R., & Sorensen, G. (1999). *Introduction to International Relations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keohane, R. O. (1988). International Institutions: Two Approaches. *International Studies Quarterly, 32*(4), 379-396. doi:10.2307/2600589

Keohane, R., & Nye, J. (1971). Transnational relations and world politics. *International Organization, 25*(3), 329-349.

Kriesberg, L. (1997). The Development of the Conflict Resolution Field. Em W. Zartman, & L. Rasmussen, *Peacekeeping in International Conflict:* (pp. 51-77). Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Kriesberg, L. (2009). The Evolution of Conflict Resolution. Em J. Bercovitch, V. A. Kremeniuk, & I. W. Zartman, *The SAGE handbook of conflict resolution* (pp. 15-32). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kurki, M., & Wight, C. (2013). International Relations and Social Science. Em T. Dunne, M. Kurki, & s. Smith, *International Relations Theories, discipline and diversity* (pp. 14-35). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lapid, Y. (September de 1989). The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era. *International Studies Quarterly, 33*(3), 235-254. doi:10.2307/2600457

Levy, J. (1998). The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace. *Annual Review of Political Science, 1*, 139-165.

Levy, J. (2007). Theory, Evidence, and Politics in the Evolution of International Relations Research Programs. Em R. N. Lebow, & M. I. Lichbach, *Theory and Evidence in Comparative Politics and International Relations.* (pp. 177-97). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Levy, J. S. (Spring de 2015). Theories of War and Peace (Syllabus Political Science 522). Rutgers University. Obtido em 6 de April de 2016, de http://home.uchicago.edu/~mjreese/CurrentStudents/LevyPS522.pdf

Levys, J. (2011). Theories and Causes of War. Em C. J. Coyne, & R. L. Mathers, *The Handbook on Political Economy of War* (pp. 13-33). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

McClintock, A. (1992). The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term "Post-Colonialism". *Social Text, 31*(32), 84-98.

Mearsheimer, J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Moriarty, P. (6 de February de 2016). *blog*. Obtido em 28 de December de 2016, de https://muircheart.wordpress.com/2016/02/06/were-flattered-but-enough-of-the-physics-envy-its-embarrassing-us-all/

Osgood, C. E. (1962). *An alternative to war or surrender.* Urbana : University of Illinois Press.

Pender, J. (2001). From 'Structural Adjustment' to 'Comprehensive Development Framework': Conditionality Transformed? *Third World Quarterly, 22*(3), 397-411.

Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T., & Miall, H. (2011). *Contemporary conflict resolution: The prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Rapoport, A., & Chammah, A. M. (1965). *Prisoner's dilemma; a study in conflict and cooperation.* Ann Arbor.: Univ. of Michigan Press.

Riche, F. (2012). A guinada quântica no pensamento de Alexander Wendt e suas implicações para a teoria das Relações Internacionais (PhD thesis). Brasília.

Rogers, P., & Ramsbotham, O. (1999). Then and Now: Peace Research—Past and Future. *Political Studies*(47), 740–754. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.00229

Sambanis, N. (2002). A Review of Recent Advances and Future Directions in the Quantitative Literature on Civil War. *Defence and Peace Economics, 13*(3), 215-243. doi:10.1080/10242690210976

Sharp, G. (1973). *The Politics of Nonviolent Action.* Boston: Porter Sargent.

Singer, J. D. (1961). The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations. *World Politics,, 14*(1), 77-92.

Sousa, R. R. (2017a). Genealogy of Behaviourist Peace Research. *JANUS.NET e-journal of International Relations, 8*(1), 1-22.

Sousa, R. R. (2017b). United Nations Security Council primacy over military interventions in Africa and the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA). Em L. Moita, & V. Pinto, *Espaços Económicos e Espaços de Segurança.* Lisboa: Universidade Autónoma de Lisboa.

Teixeira, J. (2011). *Teorias das Relações Internacionais. Da abordagem clássica ao debate pós-positivista.* Coimbra: Almedina.

The New York Times. (8 de March de 1992). Excerpts From Pentagon's Plan: 'Prevent the Re-Emergence of a New Rival'. Washington, USA. Obtido em 18 de December de 2016, de http://www.nytimes.com/1992/03/08/world/excerpts-from-pentagon-s-plan-prevent-the-re-emergence-of-a-new-rival.html?pagewanted=all

The White House. (2002). *The National Security Strategy of the United States .* Washington: The White House.

Trnka, R., & Lorencová, R. (2016). *Quantum Anthropology. Man, Culture and Groups in a Quantum Perspective.* Prague: Karolinum Press.

USCNS/21. (1999). *New World Coming: American Security in the 21st Century. The United States Commission on National Security/21st Century.* Washington, DC : US Government Printing Office.

Viotti, P., & Kauppi, M. (2012). *International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism, and Beyond.* 5th edn. Boston, MA: Longman.

Waever, O. (1995). Securitisation and Desuritisation. Em R. D. Lipschutz, *On Security* (pp. 46-87). New York: Columbia University Press.

Wæver, O. (2004). 'Aberystwyth, Paris, Copenhagen: New "Schools" in Security Theory and Their Origins Between Core and Periphery. *Paper presented at the 45th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association 17–20 March.* Montreal, Canada.

Wæver, O. (2009). Waltz's Theory of Theory. *International Relations, 23*(2), 201-222.

Waever, O., Buzan, B., Kelstrup, M., & Lemaitre, P. (1993). *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe.* London: Printer.

Wagner, B., & Gebauer, J. (2008). Alexander Wendt´s auto-critique and social constructivism. (draft version .21).

Wallensteen, P. (2001). The growing peace research agenda. *Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies*.

Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of International Politics.* MA: Addison-Wesley.

Waltz, K. N. (1959). *Man, the state, and war; a theoretical analysis.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Wendt, A. (2015). *Quantum Mind and Social Science. Unifying Physical and Social Ontology.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Westing, A. (1989). The environmental component of comprehensive security. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 20*(2), 129-134.

Williams, P. D. (2008). Security Studies: An Introduction. Em P. D. Williams, *Security Studies: An Introduction* (pp. 1-10). London and New York: Routledge.

Woolley, J. (August de 2015). Wittgenstein against 'Positivist' Approaches to International Relations: Replacing the Anti-Representationalist Objection (PhD thesis). University of East Anglia.

Wright, Q. (1942). *A Study of War.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.